

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: 04-181

CASES: TR061105

CP, OTP



***** INITIAL STUDY *****

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: June 14, 2004

Staff Member: Hsiao-ching Chen

Thomas Guide: 4549 G H, J 1-3; 4550 A1-4

USGS Quad: Newhall

Location: South of SR-126, west of I-5, directly west of Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park, and east of Lyon Canyon, Valencia

Description of Project: An application to subdivide the subject property for approximately 5,331 residential units (plus 73 second units), approximately 1,299,000 square feet of non-residential mixed-use space, a 9-acre elementary school, a 8.3-acre of private recreation center, and a system of landscaped trails and walkways. The project also includes construction of the 1,250 feet long, 117 feet wide Commerce Center Drive Bridge over the Santa Clara River with required abutments and bank stabilization on either side of the bridge as well as bank stabilization elsewhere along the Santa Clara River. Preserve for San Fernando Valley Spineflower is proposed. Three water tanks for potable and reclaimed water storage are proposed outside of the SP and tract. This Project includes easternmost 1,216 acres of the Mesas Village within the Newhall Specific Plan, which has a certified Program EIR. Project as proposed will also require an Oak Tree Permit for removal of 219 out of the 722 oak trees. A Conditional Use Permit is required for development within SEA.

Gross Area: 1,252.2 acres (including 38.1 acres of land outside of approved Newhall SP area)

Environmental Setting: The project site is bounded to the north by Route-126 and an RV Park and further to the north is Valencia Commerce Center. The Magic Mountain Theme Park lies to the east of the project. To the south and southwest is a vacant property (i.e., the proposed Stevenson Ranch Phase V SP) proposed to be developed for residential and (neighborhood) commercial uses. West of the project site is the undeveloped Newhall Ranch area with some abandoned oil and gas operations. The site currently contains some abandoned oil and gas operations and is used for agricultural purposes. Some off-site improvements which are part of the project are within Santa Clara River containing habitat for endangered unarmored threespine stickleback and San Fernando Valley spineflower is present on-site.

Zoning: Newhall Specific Plan; Heavy Agriculture A-2-5

General Plan: (Newhall) Specific Plan; Non-urban, SEA

Community/Area Wide Plan: Newhall Specific Plan; Non-urban 1 & Hillside Mgt (Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan)

Major projects in area:

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Description & Status</u>
<u>04-181/TR 061105</u>	<u>The "River Villag" project (pending)</u>
<u>00-210/TR 53295</u>	<u>The "Entrada" project (pending)</u>
<u>89-081</u>	<u>Chiquita Canyon Landfill (approved)</u>
<u>87-360</u>	<u>Valencia Commerce Center (approved)</u>
<u>03-238 / TR 60030</u>	<u>21 industrial lots on 110 AC (pending)</u>
<u>87-222/TR45433</u>	<u>The Westridge Project (05/25/1999 approved)</u>
<u>98-182</u>	<u>Stevenson Ranch Phase V Specific Plan (pending)</u>
	<u>Magic Mountain Theme Park (approved)</u>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

<u>Responsible Agencies</u>	<u>Special Reviewing Agencies</u>	<u>Regional Significance</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> None
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCAG Criteria
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles Region	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Newhall, Castaic Union SDs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Lahontan Region	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> William S. Hart SD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Castaic Area Town Council	<u>County Reviewing Agencies</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Army Corps of Engineers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Dept of Water Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Committee
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Caltrans</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>SCOPE (courtesy notification)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DPW: _____
<u>Trustee Agencies</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Valencia Water Company</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Services: <u>Env Hygiene</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>DOC DOGGR</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>San Districts, Sheriff</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Fish and Game	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>DTSC; AQMD</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>FD, Library</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Parks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>City of Santa Clarita</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Parks & Rec.</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>USFWS</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Ventura County</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>SCAG; CHP</u>	

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
		Pg	Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
					Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	FACTOR				Potential Concern	
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Seismic hazards, expansive soil, high groundwater
	2. Flood	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100-year floodplain
	3. Fire	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire Zone 4
	4. Noise	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	School/residences adjacent to SR-126/theme parks
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Construction, domestic water supply from groundwater
	2. Air Quality	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Exceed AQMD regional thresholds, non-attainment area
	3. Biota	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SEA 23, oaks, S. willow riparian habitat, spineflower
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	known resources in the area
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Site was previously used for oil extraction
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Prime farmland
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SR-126 scenic corridor
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Exceed CMP threshold
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sewage disposal prior to construction of treatment plant
	3. Education	18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Limited school space
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project specific impacts and mitigations to be determined
	5. Utilities	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Water, solid waste
OTHER	1. General	21	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Community characteristics
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Abandoned oil and gas operations
	3. Land Use	23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SP conformance review
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Demand for new recreation facility, growth inducing
	Mandatory Findings	25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biota, air quality

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS) *

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

- Development Policy Map Designation: Urban expansion and SEA
- ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
- ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☒ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: 10/19/2004

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

*EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

- ☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

- ☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

- ☒ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant."

- ☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Hsiao-ching Chen  Date: _____

Approved by: Daryl Koutnik  Date: 25 OCTOBER 2004

- ☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filing fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).
- ☐ Determination appealed--see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? Salt Creek and Del Valle Fault Zone are located to the north (per LA Co GP Safety Element Plate 1); San Gabriel Fault is approximately 2.5 miles northeast to the project site (per Special Studies Zones Map-Newhall Quad.)
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? Project site contains landslide areas (per LA Co GP Safety Element-Plate 5); earthquake-induced landslides (per Seismic Hazard Zones Map-Newhall Quad.)
- c. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
Project includes substantial grading on hillside area
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? Portions of site has groundwater levels less than 30 feet (GP Safety Element Plate 3); Liquefiable area (per LA Co General Plan Safety Element Plate 4 and the CA Seismic Hazard Zones Map Newhall Quad.)
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
Project contains an elementary school and residential development
- f. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?
Total grading is estimated to be approximately 26,500,000 cubic yards.
- g. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
Expansive soils present on site.
- h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
Santa Clara River and tributaries, Castaic Creek, Chiquito Canyon, Lyon Canyon
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
Portions of the tract are within 100-year FEMA floodplain (LA Co GP Safety Element Plate 6)
- c. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
Santa Clara River, Castaic Creek, Chiquito Canyon, and Lion Canyon
- d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from runoff? Earthwork during site development would have the potential to increase erosion and deposition during periods of heavy rain.
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
A man-made drainage network to capture and control runoff to new storm drain system.
- f. ☒ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? Site is within the Castaic Lake dam inundation area

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- ☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design
-

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

- ☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
Site is located within Fire Zone 4
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? _____
- d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? New public water system required.
- e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
Petrochemical complexes including oil fields (LA Co General Plan Safety Element Plate 7);
Identified abandoned oil and gas operations.
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8

☒ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
SR-126; Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
Residential and school components in this tract map
- c. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
The tract map will include commercial activities.
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
During construction period
- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Ordinance Title 12 Chapter 27

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

Noise study is required.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe
a. ☒ ☐ ☐

Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?

Santa Clara River- impaired waterway; groundwater pumping is proposed water resource

b. ☐ ☒ ☐

Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?

☐ ☐ ☐

If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?

c. ☒ ☐ ☐

Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?

Grading and other earth movement during construction period.

d. ☒ ☐ ☐

Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?

Urban runoff

e. ☒ ☐ ☐

Other factors? Domestic water for the site, which will be supplied by the Valencia Water Company, is a blend of imported water and groundwater withdrawn primarily from Alluvial and Saugus aquifers. Some remediation efforts for perchlorate contamination by federal and state agencies are underway.

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit

☒ Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5

☒ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)? <u>5,331 dwelling units (plus 73 second units) and a maximum of 1,299,000 square feet of non-residential mixed-used space.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?

<u>An elementary school is proposed with highway nearby</u> |
| c. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance?

<u>Project exceeds regional thresholds</u> |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?

<u>Project is adjacent to SR-126, Chiquita Canyon Landfill north of the site</u> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

<u>Santa Clarita Valley is a non-attainment area</u> |
| f. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

<u>South Coast Air Basin is a non-attainment area.</u> |
| g. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |
| h. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors: <u>Impacts associated with 26,500,000 cubic yards of grading</u> |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☒ Air Quality Report including toxic emission analysis for diesel particulates

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **air quality**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
Portion of the site is within SEA 23 Santa Clara River
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
Project will involve approximately 26,500,000 cubic yards of materials
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?
Santa Clara River and tributaries
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?
Southern willow riparian habitat
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
Coast live oaks, cottonwood trees
- f. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? San Fernando Spineflower, SEA 23 is habitat for unarmored threespine stickleback, least Bell's vervo, southwestern fly catcher, spadefoot toad.
- g. ☒ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? _____
Santa Clara River, loss of open space and wildlife habitat

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Oak Tree Permit ☒ SEATAC Review

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **biotic resources**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? Oak trees and drainage courses.
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? The Saugus and Pico Formations within the proposed development area are considered high potential to contain a diverse assemblage of marine and non-marine vertebrate fossils in the Santa Clarita Valley
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? Historical use of the site has been primarily agricultural and cattle grazing operation. However, Assistencia de San Francisco Xavier (CA-LAN-962H) is located within the tract boundary but outside of the proposed development footprint.
- d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
Project specific mitigation measures to be proposed if development impacts known sites.
- e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? The construction of proposed development may destroy Pico and Saugus Formations which have high potential for yielding paleontological resources due to project associated grading and other activities.
- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Phase I Archaeology Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
a. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

Site contains abandoned oil and gas operations.

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? Portions of the tract are prime farmland (per County of Los Angeles Important Farmland 2002 map)
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
Site is currently used for agricultural purposes
- d. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?

Project is located near the Santa Clara River/SR-126 view corridor

- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? Santa Clara River and Pico Canyon trails are in the area (per County of Los Angeles Trail System map).

- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? Area along SR-126 has view of river and mesas to south

- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?

Site is surrounded mainly by vacant land currently undeveloped

- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?

New buildings may have night lighting and glare surfaces

- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration): _____

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☒ Project Design

☒ Visual Report

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)? 5,331 residential units (plus 73 second units), a maximum of 1,299,000 square feet of non-residential mixed-used space, and a 9-acre elementary school with traffic congestion on nearly I-5.
- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
New circulation patterns
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
Sufficient parking spaces will be provided according to applicable codes
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?

- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded? Exceeds CMP thresholds for residential and commercial development
- f. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
Specific Plan consistency to be demonstrated according to provisions of the approved SP.
- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☒ Traffic Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **traffic/access** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant? Site currently is not serviced by any existing sewage system and treatment plant. Although a 6.8-mgd water reclamation plant servicing the area is proposed in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, it will not be completed prior to development of this tract. Interim plan for sewage treatment is necessary and its associated impacts will need to be analyzed.
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
No sewer lines available on site.
- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☒ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130
- ☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

- ☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at the district level? The site is within Saugus, Newhall, Castaic Union School and William S. Hart Union High School Districts which currently operate over capacity. No residential units of the proposed tract are located within Castaic Union SD. Per SP EIR, overall school demand within the SP area would be met upon completion of SP development. However, interim impact needs to be analyzed.
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?
Interim impact on junior high and high school (s) to be analyzed.
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create student transportation problems? No transportation currently exists; interim student transportation problems will occur before elementary, junior high, and high schools are constructed to adequately serve the Specific Plan area.
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
The development of the tract will create new demand to existing library services
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Other factors? Although a 9-acre elementary school site will be part of this project.

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Site Dedication ☒ Government Code Section 65995 ☒ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

The applicant has school mitigation agreements with all effected school districts

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site? According to the Specific Plan, three fire stations will be funded by the applicant per Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and two of them are within the Specific Plan area. However, these fire stations will not be in place in time before this first-phase development within the Specific Plan. The closest existing fire station is Fire Station 76 located at 27223 Henry Mayo Drive, less than 1 mile from the site. The nearest sheriff station is located at 23740 Magic Mountain Parkway. However, SP DEIR indicates that project specific impacts on sheriff department's services are to be determined at the time of project proposal. Therefore, this factor needs to be analyzed in this EIR.

b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?

New residential area to be patrolled.

c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Fire Mitigation Fees

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? DMS does not provide assessment of water supply and demand for the Valencia Water Company level. Sufficient water for the tract map has been demonstrated in the SP EIR.
- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
New water supply infrastructure is required and proposed.
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane? Gas Company and Edison's current infrastructure is capable of serving the entire SP at its build-out. (See Sections 4.14 and 4.15 from the SP EIR).
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? Newhall SP at its build-out will have unavoidable impacts on solid waste facilities. Provide project specific analysis and mitigation measures in the EIR.
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
No public infrastructure currently exists in project area.
- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities/services**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?

- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
Site is currently vacant and urban density uses are proposed

- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
See discussion under "Agriculture" resource.

- d. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors? _____

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?

- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
Propane and other pressurized tanks may be used within commercial areas
- c. ☒ ☒ ☐ Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?

- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the project site located within two miles of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed?
Site contains several abandoned oil wells; perchlorate contamination or upstream
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- g. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
Site contains abandoned oil and gas operations.
- h. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip? _____
- i. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- j. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean up Plan

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☐ ☒ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property? Areas outside of SP have land use categories of Non-urban 1 and Hillside Management. However, there are no developments proposed within these areas of the east. Water tanks are proposed for areas outside SP boundaries and outside of Castaic Lake Water Agency area.

b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?

Areas outside of SP where proposed water tanks are located are zoned A-2-5.

c. Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:

☐ ☒ ☐ Hillside Management Criteria?

☐ ☐ ☒ SEA Conformance Criteria?

Bridge proposed over SEA; proposed development eliminates upland habitat adjacent to SEA.

☒ ☐ ☐ Other? Specific Plan Resource Management Plan Conformance review.

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project physically divide an established community?

e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
Road circulation (i.e., "B" South and "VV" Streets) to property to the south.
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
Site is vacant
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents? New recreational facilities are required for the development of the SP.
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

This tentative tract map includes a private recreation center of a total of 8.3 acres and a system of landscaped trails and walkways (i.e., paseos). Roadways are proposed into currently inaccessible area.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Biota

- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

Soild Waste

- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Water quality, air quality, noise, growth inducement

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

- ☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

PROJECT NO. 04-181
CASE NO. TR061105

**URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS
WATER CAPACITY ANALYSIS**

10/19/2004

WATER AVAILABILITY EVALUATION

(ACRE-FEET/YEAR)

DEMAND

POTENTIAL

WATER COMPANY	EXISTING DEMAND	POTENTIAL				TOTAL	OTENTIAL	
		RECORDED	APPROVED	PENDING	PROJECT		DRY SUPPLY	NORMAL SUPPLY
VALENCIA WC	22,735	3,369.08	2,199.71	1,271.34	1,994.97	31,570.10		
SC VALLEY WIDE	64,350	6,862.85	5,521.85	6,585.35	1,994.97	85,315.02	90,600	96,000

NO

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY WIDE FUTURE SUPPLY

YEAR

2005	90,600	96,000	NO
2006	90,600	96,000	NO
2007	90,600	96,000	NO
2008	90,600	96,000	NO

CRITERIA

COMMERCIAL INDUSTRIAL
(PER ACRE) (PER ACRE)

DEMAND FACTORS (AF/YR):	SF	MF	MH	(PER ACRE)	(PER ACRE)
VALENCIA WC	0.56	0.30	0.09	2.77	3.14

Note:

Dry Supply - Ranges from 90,600 to 147,500 acre-feet-per year.

Conjunctive-use and groundwater banking supplies are not included in table.

Normal Supply - Ranges from 96,000 to 151,900 acre-feet-per year.

Tuesday, October 19, 2004

URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS

LIBRARY CAPACITY ANALYSIS

PROJECT NO 04-181
CASE NO. TR061105

10/19/2004

DEMAND

LIBRARY	EXISTING DEMAND	POTENTIAL					POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	
		RECORDED	APPROVED	PENDING	PROJECT	TOTAL	SUPPLY	IMPACT
VALENCIA								
VOLUMES	174,090	41,734	24,331	24,040	2,445	296,640	211,688	YES
SPACE (SQ FT)	33,861	8,117	4,732	4,676	6,311	57,696	23,966	YES
-AREA CLUSTER-*								
VOLUMES	320,598	82,886	76,886	62,659	2,445	575,474	348,467	YES
SPACE (SQ FT)	62,356	16,121	14,954	12,187	6,311	111,930	67,777	YES

* AREA CLUSTER IS THE GROUP OF LIBRARIES SERVING THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY.

CRITERIA

VOLUMES PER CAPITA:	2
SQUARE FOOT PER CAPITA:	0.389

Tuesday, October 19, 2004

PROJECT NO. 04-181
CASE NO. TR061105

URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS
SCHOOL CAPACITY ANALYSIS

10/19/2004

STUDENT EVALUATION

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ENROLLMENT	PENDING	APPROVED	RECORDED	PROJECT	TOTAL	CAPACITY	STUDENT OVERLOAD	POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
NEWHALL	6,050	750	258	902	572	8,532	4,687	3,845	YES
CASTAIC UNION JH	1,350	380	122	473	392	2,717	1,800	917	YES
WM.S. HART SR HI	9,903	1,468	1,778	1,973	523	15,645	9,512	6,133	YES

PROJECT NO. 04-181
CASE NO. TR061105

URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS
SCHOOL CAPACITY ANALYSIS
10/19/2004

STUDENT EVALUATION

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ENROLLMENT	PENDING	APPROVED	RECORDED	PROJECT	TOTAL	CAPACITY	STUDENT OVERLOAD	POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
SAUGUS UNION	8,979	533	1,970	1,421	972	13,875	7,579	6,296	YES
CASTAIC UNION JH	1,350	380	122	473	392	2,717	1,800	917	YES
WM.S. HART SR HI	9,903	1,468	1,778	1,973	523	15,645	9,512	6,133	YES

PROJECT NO. 04-181
CASE NO. TR061105

**URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS
SCHOOL CAPACITY ANALYSIS**

10/19/2004

STUDENT EVALUATION

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ENROLLMENT	PENDING	APPROVED	RECORDED	PROJECT	TOTAL	CAPACITY	STUDENT OVERLOAD	POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
CASTAIC UNION EL	1,135	722	154	684	702	3,397	1,430	1,967	YES
CASTAIC UNION JH	1,350	380	122	473	392	2,717	1,800	917	YES
WM.S. HART SR HI	9,903	1,468	1,778	1,973	523	15,645	9,512	6,133	YES

URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS

SEWER TREATMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS

(MILLION GALLONS PER DAY)

10/19/2004

PROJECT NO. 04-181

CASE NO: TR061105

SEWER AGENCY	EXISTING DEMAND	RECORDED	APPROVED	PENDING	PROJECT	TOTAL	SUPPLY	POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
S.D. NO. 26 & 32	15.04	3.42	3.21	3.01	1.19	25.88	19.10	YES

PLANNED EXPANSION

<u>SEWER AGENCY</u>	<u>TOTAL CAPACITY</u>	<u>COMPLETION EXPECTED</u>	<u>POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>
S.D. NO. 26 & 32			
FIRST STAGE	28.10	2002	NO
PRACTICAL SITE CAPACITY:	34.10	2010	NO

CRITERIA

EMAND FACTORS (GAL/DAY):	SF	MF	MH	COMMERCIAL (PER ACRE)	INDUSTRIAL (PER ACRE)
S.D. NO. 26 & 32	260	195	156	1,440	2,009

URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS
FIRE PROTECTION ANALYSIS

PROJECT NO. 04-181
CASE NO. TR061105

10/19/2004

RESPONSE DISTANCE EVALUATION (MILES)

<u>MAXIMUM DISTANCE CRITERIA</u>				
<u>Lot Type</u>	<u>Residential</u>	Commercial/ <u>Industrial</u>	<u>Approximate</u> <u>Distance</u>	Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>
COMMERCIAL		1.5	0.5	No
MULTIPLE FAMILY	1.5		0.5	No
SINGLE FAMILY	1.5		0.5	No